

# Minutes

## OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

## Planning Committee

HELD ON TUESDAY 20 MARCH 2018 AT 6.00 PM

FOUNTAIN CONFERENCE CENTRE, HOWBERY PARK, BENSON LANE,  
CROWMARSH GIFFORD, WALLINGFORD, OX10 8BA

### Present:

Toby Newman (Chairman)

Sue Lawson, Joan Bland, Anthony Dearlove, Lorraine Hillier, Elaine Hornsby, Jeannette Matelot, Richard Pullen, David Turner, Ian White and Mocky Khan

### Officers:

Katherine Canavan, Paula Fox, Lloyd Jones, Jeremy Peter, Marc Pullen, Ron Schrieber and Tom Wyatt

### Also present:

Councillors Caroline Newton and Ian Snowdon

### 246 Declarations of interest

None.

### 247 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

### 248 Applications deferred or withdrawn

Consideration of application P17/S4335/FUL, 12, The Croft, East Hagbourne, was deferred to a future meeting.

### 249 Proposals for site visit reports

None.

## **250 Public participation**

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak was tabled at the meeting.

## **251 Land at Watlington Road, Lewknor**

The committee considered application P17/S3711/O for the erection of up to 40 homes, associated open space, local area of play and other infrastructure, with all matters reserved, save for that of access, on land at Watlington Road, Lewknor.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

The planning officer reported that a further representation had been received from the landscape consultant clarifying that, although there were design issues to be resolved at reserved matters stage to minimise impact on the landscape, there was no 'in principle' objection on landscape grounds or harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Caroline Hjorth, a representative of Lewknor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

James Winspear, a representative of the Lewknor Neighbourhood Development Plan Committee, spoke objecting to the application.

Richard Mees, representing the applicant, and Roger Smith, representing the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

Caroline Newton, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

In response to questions from the committee and comments from the speakers, officers reported that:

- This was an outline application for up to 40 homes. Whilst the indicative plan showed that the site could accommodate this number of dwellings, issues relating to layout and design would be addressed at the reserved matters stage, should the application be approved.
- The application met parking standards.
- The application was comparable with the Long Wittenham appeal decision (P16/S1124/O) with regard to the matter of sustainability in a smaller village, scale of development, transport links and being located close to wider services in neighbouring towns.

Members expressed concerns about:

- Poor public transport links or cycle routes resulting in the over-reliance on private transport;
- Parking problems caused by the displacement of bus stop parking to the development and the village;
- The overly urban character of the development which was incongruous with the rural form of the village;

- Overdevelopment of the site in terms of number of units; and
- Insufficient weight being afforded to the sensitive landscape character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the development, resulting in harm to the setting.

Accordingly, they concluded that the harm caused by the development substantially outweighed the benefits and did not constitute sustainable development.

Contrary to the officer recommendation, a motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning permission for application P17/S3711/O, for the following reasons:

1. 40 dwellings cannot be adequately accommodated on the site without resulting in a development that is out of character with the rural character of the village, or being incongruous with the existing settlement pattern. The parameter plans set out a developable area that is too constrained to address these matters through a redesign of the scheme at reserved matters stage, without compromising important landscape buffering. The development fails to respect the rural character of the settlement and its setting and therefore conflicts with policy CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) and policies D1 and G2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.
2. The introduction of 40 dwellings to the village represents a disproportionate addition to a smaller village and overdevelopment of the site. The harm associated with the scale of development, in relation to the size of the existing village, and the lack of sustainability of the location, substantially outweighs the benefits. The development therefore conflicts with the overarching strategy for the district and policies CSQ3 and CSS1 of the SOCS.
3. Limited services and facilities are available in the village, and occupants of the development would be overly reliant on private transport to travel to work, local shops and secondary school education. Poor connectivity limits sustainable travel to the closest larger villages, exposing pedestrians and cyclists to highway risk and providing limited opportunity to travel by bus. Lewknor does not represent a sustainable location for this scale of development. Even in the context of reduced weight being afforded to housing policies, the proposal does not constitute sustainable development. The harm resulting from the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and, under the provision of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is refused on these grounds.
4. In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement, the proposal fails to secure infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of the development.
5. In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement, the proposal fails to secure affordable housing to meet the needs of the district.

## **252 32-34 Wantage Road, Didcot**

Anthony Dearlove, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting for this item as he would speaking on behalf of Didcot Town Council.

The committee considered application P17/S3925/FUL, a retrospective application for the retention of an extraction flue on the eastern side of the building and the retention of an external refrigeration unit covered in wood at 32-34 Wantage Road, Didcot.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Anthony Dearlove, a representative of Didcot Town Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Roy Frank Burton, a local retailer, spoke objecting to the application.

Alex Bas, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Ian Snowdon, a local ward councillor, spoke in support of the application.

Some members of the committee expressed concerns about the noise and odour generated by the extraction unit and its adverse visual impact. With regard to noise and odour, officers reported that the environmental protection team had not submitted an objection. Officers considered that changing the colour of the extractor fan would help mitigate its visual impact.

Contrary to the officer's recommendation, a motion was moved and seconded to refuse the application. On being put to the vote, the motion was lost.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P17/S3925/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans.
2. The external walls of the external refrigeration structure hereby permitted shall be clad in horizontally aligned timber boarding in accordance with details of the type of boarding and colour finish, which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be submitted for approval within one month from the date of planning permission. The details shall be carried out within 2 months of the date of approval.
3. The external flue hereby permitted shall be painted in a colour in accordance with details which shall be first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be submitted for approval within one month from the date of planning permission. The approved details shall be carried out within 2 months of the date of approval.
4. The hours of operation for the extraction system shall be restricted to 09.00- 23.00 Monday to Sunday.
5. All plant, machinery and equipment including the extraction system to be used by reason of granting of this permission shall be so installed, maintained and operated so as to ensure that the rating noise level from the equipment does not exceed the background noise level at the boundary of the premises. Measurement and rating of noise for the purposes of this condition shall be in accordance with BS4142 (2014) " Method for rating industrial and commercial sound". The measurement location shall be 1 metre from the facade of the nearest noise sensitive receptor. In the event of unacceptable noise or vibration being caused by the installed plant, machinery and equipment, the applicant or persons responsible shall investigate and undertake works to resolve the problem to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.

Informative:

It is recommended that the applicant refer to the Defra 'Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Exhaust Systems' (January 2005) for further information.

## **253 Land at Wallingford Road/Reading Road, Wallingford**

Elaine Hornsby, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting for this item.

The committee considered application P17/S3564/FUL, for the erection of a 70 bed care home (within Use Class C2), access, parking, landscaping and other associated works, at land at Wallingford Road/Reading Road, Wallingford.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Adrian Lloyd, a representative of Wallingford Town Council, spoke objecting to the application

Anna Gillings, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

Some members expressed the view that the applicant's proposed financial contribution for the provision of primary care to serve Wallingford was inadequate. However, it was noted that this was the sum that had been requested by the local NHS clinical commissioning group.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to delegate authority to the head of planning to grant planning permission for application P17/S3564/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The prior completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure financial contributions and other obligations stated above, and
- ii. The following conditions.
  1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
  2. Approved plans.
  3. Levels (details required).
  4. Sample materials required (all).
  5. Landscaping (including boundary treatment).
  6. Landscaping implementation.
  7. Existing vehicular access.
  8. Vision splay details.
  9. Turning area and car parking.
  10. Turning head.
  11. Cycle parking facilities.
  12. Construction traffic management.
  13. Green travel plans.
  14. Off-site highway works (details to be submitted).
  15. External lighting – general.

16. Surface water drainage works (details required).
17. Foul drainage works (details required).
18. Air quality mitigation.
19. Site noise – boundary noise limit.
20. Kitchen extraction noise and odour.
21. Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy (outline).
22. Tree protection (detailed) (amended no dig foundations).
23. Trees unique.

## **254 Land at Aston Rowant Road, Aston Rowant**

Ian White, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting for this item.

The committee considered application P17/S3661/FUL, for the erection of 5 two-storey 4-bedroom residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated access off Aston Rowant Road, including parking, landscaping and all enabling and ancillary works on land at Aston Rowant Road, Aston Rowant.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Peter Tinson and Peter Hetherington, representatives of Aston Rowant Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application

Peter Davis, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Jolande Bowater, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

Ian White, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee noted that the highway authority considered that the development would be unsustainable in transport terms. Members also expressed concerns about the impact that the development would have on the rural character and appearance of the village and its landscape setting.

Contrary to the officer recommendation, a motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning permission for application P17/S3661/FUL, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of an important open space beyond the built up edge of the village which would fail to respect the rural character of the site and its surroundings and the landscape setting of the village. Therefore, the development fails to adhere to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policies CSQ3, CSEN1 and CSR1 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and Policies D1, G2, H4, C4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP).
2. Due to the site's location, the proposed development would have poor access to necessary services and facilities and would be unsustainable in transport terms. Furthermore, the lack of footways and street lighting would fail to provide safe and convenient routes for pedestrians and cyclists. As such the development fails to

adhere to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy T1 of the SOLP.

[During consideration of this item, the committee resolved that, as it would not be determined before the two and a half hour cut off, application P17/S4383/FUL, Small Mead, 6 Wood Lane, Sonning Common, would not be considered at tonight's meeting.]

### **255 Small Mead, 6 Wood Lane, Sonning Common**

This item (Application P17/S4383/FUL) was not considered. No further items can be commenced after the meeting has convened for more than two and a half hours, however, items being discussed at that time can be completed subject to a committee vote. This item will be brought before a future planning committee.

### **256 12 The Croft, East Hagbourne**

Consideration of this application was deferred to a future meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm

Chairman

Date